E 390
.W31

Washington, D.C. Republican committee of seventy-six . .

"THE NORTHERN MAN WITH SOUTHERN PRINCIPLES,"

AND THE

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
OF WASHINGTON

SOUTHERN MAN WITH AMERICAN PRINCIPLES.

The partisans of Mr. VAN BUREN, in order to recommend him to the suffrages of the South, have invented for him the title of "the Northern Man with Southern Principles." Let us try this title by the test of evidence, and compare it with Gen. HARRISON'S claims, examined in the same way, to the favour of the South.

I. THE POWER OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT TO ABOLISH SLAVERY IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA is regarded by all the slaveholding States as a *test question.* What are the opinions of the two candidates on this question?

MR. VAN BUREN'S OPINION.

On the 23d of February, 1836, Messrs. Junius Amis and others, citizens of North-Carolina, addressed a letter to Mr. Van Buren, in which they say:

"A portion of your fellow-citizens in this section, feeling a deep anxiety as to your views on *a topic which most vitally affects our immediate welfare and happiness,* have thought proper to propound to you the following interrogatory, to which we wish an explicit answer:

"Do you or do you not believe that Congress has the constitutional power to interfere with or abolish slavery in the District of Columbia?"

On the 6th of March, 1836, Mr. VAN BUREN answered the question in an argumentative and explanatory letter, in which he says:

"I would not, from the lights now before me, feel myself safe in pronouncing that Congress does not possess the power of interfering with or abolishing slavery in the District of Columbia."

This, though not as explicit in its language as it might have been, is explicit enough in substance. The English of it is, that Mr. VAN BUREN DOES "believe that Congress HAS the constitutional power to interfere with or abolish slavery in the District of Columbia."

In a subsequent part of the same letter he says, if elected,

"I must go into the Presidential chair the inflexible and uncompromising opponent of any attempt, on the part of Congress, to abolish slavery in the District of Columbia, against the wishes of the slaveholding States; and also with the determination, equally decided, to resist the slightest interference with the subject in the States where it exists."

GEN. HARRISON'S OPINION.

On the 30th of September, 1836, Judge John M. Berrien, of Georgia, addressed a letter to Gen. HARRISON, in which the following question is asked:

"Can the Congress of the United States, consistently with the Constitution, abolish slavery either in the States or in the District of Columbia?"

Gen. HARRISON answers:

"I do not think that Congress can abolish, or in any manner interfere with slavery, as it exists in the States, but upon the application of the States, nor abolish slavery in the District of Columbia, without the consent of the States of Virginia and Maryland, and the people of the District. The first would be, in my opinion, a palpable violation of the Constitution, and the latter a breach of faith towards the States I have mentioned, who would certainly not have made the cession, if they had supposed that it would ever be used for a purpose so different from that which was its object, and so injurious to them as the location of a free colored population in the midst of their slave population of the same description. Nor do I believe that Congress could deprive the people of the District of Columbia of their property, without their consent. It would be reviving the doctrine of the tories of Great Britain, in relation to the powers of Parliament over the Colonies, before the revolutionary war,

and in direct hostility to the principle advanced by Lord Chatham, that 'what was a man's own was absolutely and exclusively his own, and could not be taken from him without his consent, given by himself or his legal representative.'"

To a similar question, put by Thomas Sloo, Jun., of New-Orleans, Gen. HARRISON answers, November 25th, 1836:

"First. I do not believe that Congress can abolish slavery in the States, or *in any manner interfere with the property of the citizens in their slaves*, but upon the application of the States; in which case, and in no other, they might appropriate money to aid the States so applying to get rid of their slaves. These opinions I have always held, and this was the ground upon which I voted against the Missouri restriction in the Fifteenth Congress. The opinions given above are precisely those which were entertained by Mr. Jefferson and Mr. Madison.

"Second. I do not believe that Congress can abolish slavery in the District of Columbia, without the consent of Virginia and Maryland, and the people of the District."

In his speech at Vincennes, Indiana, July 4th, 1835, Gen. HARRISON says that the efforts of the abolitionists are "weak, injudicious, presumptuous, and *unconstitutional*," and are in conflict with the rights of the States. When that speech was delivered, the halls of Congress were flooded with petitions for abolishing slavery in the District of Columbia.

In a letter to Harmar Denny, dated December 2, 1838, Gen. HARRISON states, as a principle "proper to be adopted by any Executive sincerely desirous to restore the Administration to its original simplicity and purity;" "that, in the exercise of the veto power, he should limit his rejection of bills to, 1st, such as are in his opinion *unconstitutional;* 2d, such as tend to encroach on the rights of the States or of individuals; such as, involving deep interests, may in his opinion require more mature deliberation, or reference to the will of the people, to be ascertained at the succeeding elections."

It thus appears that Mr. VAN BUREN believes that a bill abolishing slavery in the District of Columbia will be CONSTITUTIONAL, but would veto it because he thinks that it would be INEXPEDIENT; and that Gen. HARRISON would veto such a bill, on the ground of its being UNCONSTITUTIONAL. On which pledge can the South more safely rely? On HARRISON'S pledge, founded on a confessed *want of power and of right;* or on VAN BUREN'S pledge, *asserting the power and the right*, but waiving the exercise of them on considerations of expediency, which may be one thing to-day and another thing to-morrow? Gen. HARRISON'S pledge meets the question at the threshold, and settles it; Mr. VAN BUREN'S pledge keeps the question perpetually open to the influence of ever-varying circumstances.

II. VOTES AND SPEECHES OF MR. MARTIN VAN BUREN, ON THE ELECTIVE FRANCHISE AND NEGRO SUFFRAGE, DULY AUTHENTICATED AND VERIFIED.

Extracts from the Journal of the Convention of the State of New-York, begun and held at the Capitol in the City of Albany, on the 28th day of August, 1821:

[Page 90.] "Thursday, ten o'clock, A. M., September 20, 1821.

"The Convention met pursuant to adjournment. On motion of Mr. N. Sandford, the Convention then resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on the Report of the Committee on the right of suffrage, and the qualifications of persons to be elected; and after some time spent thereon, Mr. President resumed the chair, and Mr. N. Williams, from the said Committee, reported, that in further proceeding on the said Report, the first amendment proposed by the Select Committee was again read, in the words following, to wit:

"Every white male citizen, of the age of twenty-one years, who shall have resided in this State six months next preceding any election, and shall, within one year preceding the election, have paid any tax assessed upon him, or shall, within one year preceding the election, have been assessed to work on a public road, and shall have performed the work assessed upon him, or shall have paid an equivalent in money therefor, according to law, or shall, within one preceding the election, have been enrolled in the militia of this State, and shall have served therein according to law, shall be entitled to vote at such election in the town or ward in which he shall reside, for Governor, Lieutenant-Governor, Senators, Members of the Assembly, and all other officers who are or may be elected by the people.

"That Mr. Jay made a motion to strike out the word "*white*," in the first line of the said amendment.

"That debates were had thereon; and the question having been put, whether the Committee would agree to the said motion, it was carried in the affirmative.

"That the yeas and nays being called for by Mr. R. Clarke, seconded by Mr. Tallmadge, and having been required by ten members, were as follows, to wit: Ayes, 63. Nays, 59.

FOR THE AFFIRMATIVE.

Mr. Bacon,	Mr. Eastwood,	Mr. Park,	Mr. Tallmadge,
Baker,	Edwards,	Paulding,	Tuttle,
Barlow,	Ferris,	Pitcher,	*Van Buren*,
Beckwith,	Fish,	Platt,	Van Ness,
Birdseye,	Hallock,	Reeve,	J. R. Van Rensselaer,
Brienkerhoff,	Hees,	Rhinelander,	S. Van Rensselaer,
Brooks,	Hogeboom,	Richards,	Van Vechten,
Buel,	Hunting,	Rogers,	Ward,
Burroughs,	Huntington,	Rosebrugh,	A. Webster,
Carver.,	Jay,	Sanders,	Wendover,
R. Clarke,	Jones,	N. Sandford,	Wheaton,
Collins,	Kent,	Seaman,	E. Williams,
Cramer,	King,	Steele,	Woodward,
Day,	Moore,	D. Southerland,	Wooster,
Dodge,	Munro,	Swift,	Yates.
Duer,	Nelson,	Sylvester,	

FOR THE NEGATIVE.

Mr. Bowman,	Mr. Hunt,	Mr. Radcliff,	Mr. Starkweather,
Breese,	Hunter,	Rockwell,	J. Sutherland,
Briggs,	Hurd,	Root,	Taylor,
Carpenter,	Knowles,	Rose,	Ten Eyck,
Case,	Lansing,	Ross,	Townley,
Child,	Lawrence,	Russell,	Townsend,
D. Clark,	Lefferts,	Sage,	Tripp,
Clyde,	A. Livingston,	R. Sandford,	Van Fleet,
Dubois,	P. R. Livingston,	Schenck,	Van Horne,
Dyckman,	McCall,	Seeley,	Verbryck,
Fairlie,	Millikin,	Sharpe,	E. Webster,
Fenton,	Pike,	Sheldon,	Wheeler,
Frost,	Porter,	J. Smith,	Woods,
Howe,	Price,	R. Smith,	Young.
Humphrey,	Pumpelly,	Spencer,	

"STATE OF NEW-YORK, *Secretary's Office.*

"I certify that I have compared the foregoing extracts with the original passages contained in the Journal of the Convention of the State of New-York, begun and held at the Capitol, in the City of Albany, on the twenty-eighth day of August, 1821, printed by the Printers to the State, and deposited in this office, and now in my custody, and that the same are correct transcripts therefrom, and of the whole of the said original passages.

"In testimony whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my seal of office, at Albany, this twenty-third day of June, 1840.

"JOHN C. SPENCER, *Secretary of State.*"

Extracts from Carter and Stone's Reports of the proceedings and debates in the Convention of 1821, assembled for the purpose of amending the Constitution of the State of New-York.

Extract from proceedings of Thursday, September 27, 1821—*page* 277.

RIGHT OF SUFFRAGE.

"Mr. VAN BUREN felt himself called on to make a few remarks in reply to the gentleman from Delaware. He observed that it was evident, and, indeed, some gentlemen did not seem disposed to disguise it, that the amendment, proposed by the honorable gentleman from Delaware, contemplated nothing short of universal suffrage. Mr. Van Buren did not believe that there were twenty members of that Committee who, were the bare naked question of universal suffrage put to them, would vote in its favor; and he was very sure that its adoption was not expected, and would not meet the views of their constituents.

"Mr. Van Buren then replied to a statement made yesterday by his honorable and venerable friend from Erie, (Mr. Russell,) in relation to the exclusion of soldiers who had fought at Quebec and Stoney Point, under the banners of Montgomery and Wayne. And he felt the necessity of doing this, because such cases, urged by such gentlemen as his honorable friend, were calculated to make a deep and lasting impression. But although a regard for them did honor to that gentleman, yet it was the duty of the Convention to guard against the admission of those impressions which sympathy, in individual cases, may excite. It was always dangerous to legislate upon the impulse of individual cases where the law, about to be enacted, is to have a general operation. With reference to the case of our soldiers, the people of this State and Country had certainly redeemed themselves from the imputation that republics are ungrateful; with an honorable liberality they had bestowed the military lands upon them, and to gladden the evening of their days had provided them with pensions. Few of those pa

triots were now living [illegible] than few, the number was yearly diminishing. In fifteen years, the grave will have covered all those who now survived. Was it not, then, unwise to hazard a wholesome restrictive provision, lest, in its operation, it might affect these few individuals for a very short time? He would add no more. His duty would not permit him to say less.

"One word on the main question before the Committee. We had already reached the verge of universal suffrage. There was but one step beyond. And are gentlemen prepared to take that step? We were cheapening this invaluable right. He was disposed to go as far as any man in the extension of rational liberty; but he could not consent to undervalue this precious privilege so far as to confer it, with an undiscriminating hand, upon every one, black or white, who would be kind enough to condescend to accept it."

Extract from proceedings of Saturday, October 6, 1821—*page* 366.

The question in order was on the part of the section expressed in the words following:

"And, also, every male citizen, of the age of twenty-one years, who shall have been, for three years next preceding such election, an inhabitant of this State, and for the last year a resident in the town, county, or district, where he may offer his vote, and shall have been, within the last year, assessed to labor upon the public highways, and shall have performed the labor, or paid an equivalent therefor, according to law, shall be entitled to vote in the town or ward where he actually resides, and not elsewhere, for all officers that now are or hereafter may be elective by the people.

"Mr. VAN BUREN said, that as the vote he should now give, on what was called the highway qualification, would be different from what it had been on a former occasion, he felt it a duty to make a brief explanation of the motives which governed him. The qualifications reported by the first Committee were of three kinds, viz: the payment of a money tax, the performance of military duty, and working on the highway. The two former had met with his decided approbation; to the latter, he wished to add the additional qualification, that the elector should, if he paid no tax, performed no militia duty, but offered his vote on the sole ground that he had labored on the highways, also be a *householder*; and that was the only point in which he had dissented from the report of the Committee. To effect this object, he supported a motion, made by a gentleman from Dutchess, to strike out the highway qualification, with a view of adding "*householder*." That motion, after full discussion, had prevailed by a majority of twenty. But what was the consequence? The very next day, the same gentlemen who thought the highway tax too liberal a qualification, voted that every person of twenty-one years of age, having a certain term of residence, and excluding *actual* paupers, should be permitted to vote for any officer in the Government, from the highest to the lowest—far out-vieing, in this particular, the other States in the Union, and verging from the extreme of restricted, to that of universal suffrage. The Convention, sensible of the very great stride which had been taken by the last vote, the next morning referred the whole matter to a Select Committee of thirteen, whose report was now under consideration. That Committee, though composed of gentlemen, a large majority of whom had voted for the proposition for universal suffrage, had now recommended a middle course, viz: the payment of a money tax, or labor on the highway, excluding militia service, which had, however, been very properly reinstated. The question then recurred, shall an attempt be again made to add that of householder to the highway qualification, and run the hazard of the re-introduction of the proposition of the gentleman from Washington, abandoning all qualifications, and throwing open the ballot-boxes to every body—demolishing, at one blow, the distinctive character of an elector, the proudest and most invaluable attribute of freemen?"

Extract from the proceedings of Monday, October 8, 1821.

QUALIFICATIONS OF COLORED PERSONS.

[Page 374.] Mr. PLATT moved to expunge the proviso in the first section, which declares that no person, *other than a white man*, shall vote, unless he have a freehold estate of the value of two hundred and fifty dollars.

[Page 376.] Mr. VAN BUREN said he had voted against a total and unqualified exclusion, for he would not draw a revenue from them, and yet deny to them the right of suffrage. But this proviso met his approbation. They were exempted from taxation until they had qualified themselves to vote. The right was not denied, to exclude any portion of the community who will not exercise the right of suffrage in its purity. This held out inducements to industry, and would receive his support.

[Page 377.] The question on striking out the proviso was then taken by ayes and noes, and decided as follows:

FOR THE NEGATIVE.

Mr. Baker,	Mr. Howe,	Mr. Reeve,	Mr. Tallmadge,
Beckwith,	Humphrey.	Richards,	Taylor,
Bowman,	Hunt,	Rockwell,	Ten Eyck,
Breese,	Hunter,	Rose.	Townley,
Briggs,	Hunting,	Ross,	Townsend,
Burroughs,	Hurd,	Russell,	Tripp,
Carpenter,	Lansing,	Sage,	Tuttle.
Carver,	Lawrence,	R. Sanford,	*Van Buren,*
Case,	A. Livingston,	Schenck,	Van Fleet,
D. Clarke,	P. R. Livingston,	Seaman,	Van Horne,

Cramer,	McCall,	Seeley,	Ward,
Dubois,	Moore,	Sharpe,	A. Webster,
Dyckman,	Nelson,	Sheldon,	Wendover,
Edwards,	Park,	I. Smith,	N. Williams,
Fairlie,	Porter,	R. Smith,	Woods,
Fenton,	Price,	Stagg,	Yates,
Ferris,	Pompelly,	Starkweather,	Young.—71.
Frost,	Radclif,	Swift,	

FOR THE AFFIRMATIVE.

Mr. Bacon,	Mr. Eastwood,	Mr. Munro,	Mr. Spencer,
Barlow,	Fish,	Paulding,	Sylvester,
Birdseye,	Hees,	Pitcher,	Van Ness,
Brooks,	Hogeboom,	Platt,	J. R. Van Rensselaer,
Buel,	Huntington,	Rhinelander,	S. Van Rensselaer,
Child,	Jay,	Root,	Wheaton,
R. Clarke,	Jones,	Sanders,	E. Williams,
Day,	Kent,	N. Sandford,	Wooster.—33.
Duer,			

I certify that I have carefully compared the foregoing extracts from the printed book entitled "Reports of the Proceedings and Debates of the Convention of 1821, assembled for the purpose of amending the Constitution of the State of New-York, containing all the official documents relating to the subject, and other valuable matter, by Nathaniel H. Carter and William L. Stone, reporters, and Marcus T. C. Gould, stenographer, Albany—printed and published by E. & E. Hosford, 1821"—and that the preceding are faithful copies of the passages extracted, and of the whole of such passages.

Albany, June 23, 1840. JOHN C. SPENCER.

From the foregoing extracts it appears that Mr. VAN BUREN, as a member of the New-York Convention, supported a proposition which made the negro equal to the white man, as to the right of voting. That after settling that principle, he voted to annul the restriction of a freehold qualification to the negro voter. That he was of opinion that the "*invaluable right of suffrage*" would be "CHEAPENED" too much by being allowed to *white* men, who paid no tax and performed no militia duty, but who worked on the highways or public roads, unless they were "*householders*;" that the "*invaluable right of suffrage*" would NOT be "CHEAPENED" at all by being allowed to *negro* freeholders. That some *white* men ARE NOT GOOD ENOUGH, unless they are householders, to VOTE IN ANY ELECTION; but every *negro*, owning a freehold estate of a given value, IS GOOD ENOUGH TO VOTE IN EVERY ELECTION. And we are asked to believe that these are "SOUTHERN *principles!*"

III. OPINIONS OF MR. VAN BUREN AND GENERAL HARRISON ON THE COMPETENCY OF NEGRO TESTIMONY AGAINST WHITE PERSONS.

MR. VAN BUREN.

On the 27th of May, 1839, a Naval General Court-Martial assembled on board the United States Ship Macedonian, lying at Pensacola, to try Lieutenant George Mason Hooe, of Virginia, on certain charges preferred on the information of Commander Uriah P. Levy. In the course of the trial, two negroes were produced as witnesses against him; one the cook, and the other the body servant of his accuser. He objected to their examination; the Court overruled his objection, and allowed them to be examined. Lieutenant Hooe declined to cross-examine them. The proceedings of the Court were approved by the Secretary of the Navy. Lieutenant Hooe addressed a memorial to the President, in which he complained of the outrage. The President endorsed his decision on the papers in the following words:

"THE PRESIDENT FINDS NOTHING IN THE PROCEEDINGS IN THE CASE OF LIEUTENANT HOOE WHICH REQUIRES HIS INTERFERENCE.

M. V. B."

On the 12th of June, 1840, this subject was brought to the notice of Congress by the Hon. JOHN M. BOTTS, a member of the House of Representatives from Virginia, and on the next day that body adopted a resolution calling on the Secretary of the Navy for a copy of the record and of the subsequent proceedings. On the 24th of June the copy was

transmitted, being *Document No.* 244, 26*th Congress*, 1*st Session*, *House of Representatives*, *Navy Department.*

The following are extracts from the Document:

[Page 22.] "*James Mitchell*, Captain's Steward of the United States Ship Vandalia, called and sworn.

"The accused objected to the examination of the witness, upon the ground that he was a colored man.

"The Court, after deliberation, did not consider the objection a valid one, and ordered the examination to proceed.

"The accused then offered a paper writing, of which the following is a copy, and desired that the same be spread upon the record:

"'The accused begs leave to state to the Court most distinctly that he solemnly protests against the evidence of this witness being received and recorded. It is far from the wish of the accused to object to any evidence which the Court may deem legal; but the witness is a colored man, and therefore, in the opinion of the accused, is not a competent witness, even before this tribunal.

"'G. M. HOOE, *Lieutenant U. S. Navy.*'"

[Page 23.] "The accused presented a paper writing, of which the following is a copy, and requested that the same be spread upon the record, which was ordered by the Court:

"'The accused having protested against the evidence of this witness, on the ground that he conceives his testimony to be altogether illegal, that he knows it would be so considered before the civil tribunals of this Territory, the forms and customs of which, he humbly thinks, should be as closely followed by a martial court as possible; therefore asks leave to spread upon the record the fact that he cannot consent to, and has totally declined cross-examining this witness.

"'GEORGE MASON HOOE, *Lieut. U. S. Navy.*'"

[Page 25.] "*Daniel Waters* Captain's Cook of the United States Ship Vandalia, called and sworn.

"The accused presented a paper writing, of which the following is a copy, and requested that the same be spread upon the record, which was ordered:

"'The Court having decided to receive and record the testimony of colored persons, the accused, in regard to this witness, can only reiterate his objections as set forth in the case of Mitchell, the Captain's Steward. The accused will pursue the same course with this witness that he decided to take with the other colored man.

"'GEORGE MASON HOOE, *Lieut. U. S. Navy.*'"

[Page 42.] "At the close of the proceedings of the Court is the approval of the Secretary of the Navy, in these words:

"'Approved. J. K. PAULDING.'"

[Page 60–61.] *Extract from the Letter or Memorial of Lieutenant Hooe to the President of the Unitsd States.*

"There is one other point in the proceedings of the Court (touching their legality) to which I invite the particular attention of your Excellency. It respects a matter as to which all Southern men are deeply sensitive; and, if not overruled by your Excellency, will assuredly drive many valuable men from the Navy. In the progress of the proceedings of this Court, two negroes—one the cook, the other the private steward of Commander Levy—were introduced as witnesses against me. I protested against their legal competency to be witnesses in the Territory of Florida, on the ground that they were negroes. The Court disregarded my exception, and, as the record shows, they were allowed to be examined and to testify on my trial. This I charge as a proceeding illegal and erroneous on the part of the Court; and, if so, according to established law and precedent, must vitiate and set aside their whole proceedings."

[Page 61.] *Letter from the Secretary of the Navy to the President.*

"Navy Department, *December* 14, 1839.

"Sir: In obedience to your directions, I have the honor to transmit a report in the case of Lieutenant George Mason Hooe, and to return the memorial addressed to you by him, in relation to the proceedings of the Court on his trial.

"I am, very respectfully, your obedient servant, J. K. PAULDING."

Endorsement on the above Letter by Martin Van Buren, President of the United States, with his own hand.

"THE PRESIDENT FINDS NOTHING IN THE PROCEEDINGS IN THE CASE OF LIEUTENANT HOOE WHICH REQUIRES HIS INTERFERENCE.

"M. V. B."

ANOTHER CASE.—CASE OF MR. MURCH.

The following letter is from a gentleman of the highest standing in the State of Delaware:

NEWCASTLE COUNTY, DEL., *August* 3, 1840.

DEAR SIR: That the South may be informed correctly, in regard to Mr. Van Buren, I send you for publication certain facts in relation to his approval of negro testimony, in the trial of an officer in the revenue service, before the Collector of this District, in June, 1839.

At that time charges and specifications of them were preferred by a certain Henry D. Nones, a Captain in the revenue cutter service, against Josiah Murch, then First Lieutenant in the same service. The Collector of the District, Henry Whiteley, Esquire, was ordered by the Secretary of the Treasury to conduct the examination. Mr. Murch was defended by counsel, and the prosecution in behalf of the Captain carried on by counsel employed by himself. The character of the testimony, on the part of the complainant, generally, was such, that the counsel for Mr. Murch deemed it unnecessary to enter upon any defence; it was composed entirely of the crew and officers under the immediate command of the complainant, (Nones,) and of negroes, his own servants, employed in the ward-room. Five negroes, if I am correctly informed, were brought forward to testify. The moment the first was called to the stand, Mr. Murch and his counsel (protesting against such evidence, it not being competent in the Courts of this State for negroes to testify against white persons) left the room. The Collector, however, proceeded to take the testimony, and, after closing the same, forwarded it to Washington; the whole of which I presume you can find in the office of the Secretary of the Treasury. A copy of one of the negro depositions I now have before me. Mr. Murch had his commission taken from him; the testimony having been laid before the President and "approved by him." So unexpected was this decision to Mr. Murch, and indeed to every one who knew the character of the testimony adduced against him, that Mr. Murch thought it proper to appeal directly to the President for reinstatement. He did so both personally and by letter. To impress more fully upon the minds of the powers that be at Washington the injustice done to him, Mr. Murch forwarded to the Secretary of the Treasury a deposition of one of the negroes, taken at the negro's own request, after his discharge from the cutter, by a magistrate of the town of Newcastle, in which he states that what he testified to before Colonel Whiteley, the Collector, was false, "that he was compelled, by threats made by Captain Nones, to give such testimony," &c., &c. Upon the receipt of this deposition by Mr. Woodbury, the Secretary of the Treasury, he informed Mr. Murch, in substance, by letter, "that this testimony of the negro could not go to rebut his first deposition, but might be made the groundwork of new proceedings against Captain Nones"—(I have not the letter before me, and therefore merely give the substance)—to which Mr. Murch, under date of September 10, 1839, made the following reply, after acknowledging the receipt of Mr. Woodbury's letter of the 6th instant. He says: "I have to say that the affidavit of William Kork [negro] was sent to the Department not for the purpose of commencing new proceedings against Captain Nones, or any other person, but with the object of showing to the Department the character of the evidence on which my dismissal has been founded." Several letters were written to the Department and to the President, by the friends of Mr. Murch, and, I think, a formal remonstrance sent by his counsel to the Treasury Department. On the 4th of January, 1840, the Secretary of the Treasury wrote to me (who had addressed a letter directly to the President in regard to Mr. Murch) as follows: "Sir, in reply to your letter of the 27th ultimo, to the President of the United States, which has been referred to this Department, I would inform you that Lieutenant Murch was dismissed from the revenue service by the President, *on satisfactory evidence* of improper conduct, which, though the charges and proof have been once or twice re-examined, has never been satisfactorily rebutted or explained."

These proceedings are now matter of record, or ought to be, in the Treasury Department; copies of most of which I took the precaution at the time to retain. If you think any good can be had by publishing it, please do so, and make whatever remarks you may think proper. I will only add that no officer, however high or honest, is safe for a moment, if the Government is to tolerate negroes, under the immediate control of an officer, to give testimony against another whom he has thought proper to prefer charges against.

P. S. You will perceive that Woodbury was willing for Murch to make the deposition of the negro Kork sufficient ground to commence proceedings upon against Nones.

Mr. VAN BUREN *then thinks it perfectly proper that* NEGROES SHOULD BE EXAMINED AS WITNESSES AGAINST WHITE MEN!!!*

NOT SO GENERAL HARRISON. In the Laws of the Indiana Territory, printed at Vincennes, Indiana, by Messrs. Stout & Smoot, in 1807, and in the Library of the State Department, Washington City, is the following:

* While this decision of the President was *unknown to the public*, the Secretary of the Navy wrote a letter, dated April 15, 1840, which has since been published in Mr. Ritchie's "Crisis" of June 20, 1840. In this letter the Secretary, *after justifying the examination of the negroes*, and the sentence of the Court, says, "*The President had* NOTHING TO DO *with the Court or* ITS PROCEEDINGS!!!!"

[Chapter 46, page 311.] "*An Act regulating the Practice in the General Court and Court of Common Pleas, and for other purposes.*

"SECTION 24. No negro, mulatto, or Indian, shall be a witness, except in pleas of the United States against negroes, mulattoes, or Indians, or in civil pleas where negroes, mulattoes, or Indians alone shall be parties.

"JESSE B. THOMAS, *Speaker of the House of Representatives.*
"B. CHAMBERS, *President of the Council.*
"APPROVED, *September* 17, 1807. WILLIAM HENRY HARRISON."

IV. MISSOURI QUESTION.

Akin to the topics just mentioned is the conduct of the two candidates on the Missouri Question:

MR. VAN BUREN'S COURSE.

RUFUS KING was elected a member of the Senate of the United States for six years from March 4, 1813, by the votes of the old Federal party in New-York. During the last year of his term, a bill was sent to the Senate, from the House of Representatives, entitled "An act to authorize the people of the Missouri Territory to form a Constitution and State Government, and for the admission of such State into the Union, *on an equal footing with the original States.*" A proposition was introduced into the Senate to amend it by a clause prohibiting slavery, which proposition was sustained throughout by Rufus King. "The substance" of two elaborate speeches from him, in favor of it, may be found in Niles's Register, vol. 17, pp. 215–221.

In a letter dated April 22, 1820, to John Holmes, on the Missouri Question, Mr. Jefferson says:

"I had for a long time ceased to read newspapers, or pay any attention to public affairs, confident they were in good hands, and content to be a passenger in our bark to the shore from which I am not distant. But this momentous question, *like a fire bell in the night, awakened and filled me with terror. I considered it at once as the knell of the Union.*"—[*Jefferson's Writings, vol.* 4, *p.* 323.]

In the winter of 1819–'20, Mr. VAN BUREN, then a member of the Legislature of New-York, published a pamphlet in support of Mr. KING's re-election, entitled "Considerations in favor of the appointment of RUFUS KING to the Senate of the United States. He also addressed a letter to a friend, in which he says:

"I should *sorely regret to find any flagging on the subject of Mr.* KING. *We are committed to his support. It is both wise and honest; and we must have no fluttering in our course.* Mr. King's views towards us are honorable and correct. The Missouri Question conceals, *so far as he is concerned*, no plot, and we shall give it a true direction. You know what the feelings and views of our friends were when I saw you, and you know what we then concluded to do. My '*Considerations*,' &c., and the aspect of the Albany Argus, will show you that we have entered on the work in earnest. We cannot, therefore, look back. *Let us not, then, have any halting. I will put my head on its propriety.*"*

RUFUS KING was accordingly re-elected to the Senate. The following preamble and resolution were adopted by both Houses of the Legislature of New-York:

* This extract will be found in page 144 of a life of Mr. VAN BUREN, (published in 1835,) written by William H. Holland, with the aid, he tells us in the preface, of "the Hon. James Vanderpoel and the Hon. Benjamin F. Butler," two well-known partisans of Mr. Van Buren. The authenticity of Holland's work is admitted by Mr. *Van Buren.* Messrs. W. Fithian, J. C. Alexander, and others, in a letter to him, dated Danville, Illinois, May 23, 1840, put several questions, one of which is: "Have you examined Holland's life of Van Buren, of date of 1835; and, if so, is it a faithful and true history of your political opinions?" Mr. VAN BUREN answers the letter, June 22, 1840, and says, in reference to Holland's life of him: "It has been suggested to me that spurious copies of this work have been put in circulation in Illinois; it is therefore desirable that you should send me the copy to which your question relates, before I answer it. This I will thank you to do at your earliest convenience. When inspected, it shall be returned to you."—Niles's Register, vol. 58, page 364. On the 29th of August, 1840, Mr. VAN BUREN sends a further answer; at the close of which he says: "*The publication sent to me by Mr. Alexander is a genuine copy of the first edition of Professor Holland's work.* I herewith return it, with the remark that it was written without communication with me, but contains, as far as it goes, *a substantially correct history of my political course.*"

The extract given in the text is published also in Niles's Register, vol. 49, page 93; the word "sorely" being omitted, and the word "committed" being printed "submitted."

"Whereas the inhibiting of the further extension of slavery in these United States is a subject of deep concern to the people of this State; and whereas we consider slavery as an evil much to be deplored, and that every constitutional barrier should be interposed to prevent its further extension; and that the Constitution of the United States clearly giving Congress the right to require of new States, not comprehended within the original boundaries of the United States, the prohibiting of slavery as a condition of their admission into the Union; therefore,

"*Resolved*, (if the honorable Senate concur therein,) That our Senators be instructed, and our Representatives in Congress be requested, to oppose the admission, as a State, into the Union, of any Territory not comprised as aforesaid, making the prohibition of slavery therein an indispensable condition of admission."

On the 29th January, 1820, the *Senate* took up the resolution, and passed the same unanimously, the following Senators being present:

"Messrs. Adams, Austin, Barnum, Bartow, Browne, Childs, Dudley, Dayton, Ditmiss, Evans, Forthington, Hammond, Hart, Livingston, Loundsberry, McMartin, Moons, Mallory, Moore, Noyes, Paine, Ross, Rosencrantz, Skinner, Swan, VAN BUREN, Wilson, Young—29."

It thus appears that Mr. VAN BUREN was the champion of the re-election of the great champion of the Missouri restriction; staked his head on its "*propriety*," denounced any "*flagging*," "*fluttering*," or "*halting*," in sending Mr. King to the Senate again, to ring the "KNELL OF THE UNION;" and after having procured the re-election of Mr. King, to make assurance doubly sure, joined in *instructing* him to peal that fearful alarm.

What, on this subject, was GENERAL HARRISON's course? When the Missouri question was agitated in the House of Representatives, at the session of 1818—1819, (second Congress, fifteenth session,) he was a member of that House from Ohio, a non-slaveholding State. The agitation of that question shook, as is well known, the Union to its centre. On reference to the Journal of the House of Representatives, (page 271—274, &c., &c.,) it will be found that on the motion to prohibit the further introduction of slavery into Missouri, and on the other questions growing out of that motion, GENERAL HARRISON voted with the *South*. His course, on this momentous subject, prevented his re-election to Congress, when he again became a candidate. The National Intelligencer, of October 20, 1822, says:

"It is confirmed to us that Mr. Gagely is elected, in opposition to GENERAL HARRISON. A friend informs us, which we are sorry to learn, that he was opposed particularly on account of his adherence to that principle of the Constitution which secures to the people of the South their pre-existing rights."

V. THE ARKANSAS AND FLORIDA QUESTIONS.

GENERAL HARRISON'S COURSE ON THE ARKANSAS QUESTION.

On the 18th of February, 1819, a bill for establishing a separate Territorial Government in the southern part of the Territory of Misssouri, was, with certain amendments which had been made thereto, taken up in the House of Representatives. Mr. Taylor, of New-York, moved a further amendment, "that neither slavery nor involuntary servitude shall be introduced into the said Territory, otherwise than for the punishment of crimes, whereof the party shall have been duly convicted."

On this amendment, GENERAL HARRISON went with the *South*.—[*See Journal House of Representatives, 2d Session 15th Congress*, 1818–'19, *page* 283–'4.]

MR. VAN BUREN'S COURSE ON THE FLORIDA QUESTION.

On the 6th of February, 1822, a bill was reported to the Senate of the United States for the establishment of a Territorial Government in Florida. On the 6th of March, 1822, after various intervening proceedings, the Senate resumed, as in Committee of the Whole, the consideration of the bill for the establishment of a Territorial Government in Florida; and, the bill having been amended, it was reported to the House accordingly; and,

On the question to concur in the amendment to the eleventh section to strike out, after the word "freedom," in the fourteenth line thereof, the residue of said section, as follows:

"No slave or slaves shall, directly or indirectly, be introduced into the said Territory, except by a citizen of the United States removing into the said Territory for actual settlement, and being, at the time of such removal, *bona fide* owner of such slave or slaves; or any citizen of the United States

travelling into the said Territory with any servant or servants, not exceeding two; and every sla imported or brought into the said Territory, contrary to the provisions of this act, shall thereupon entitled to and receive his or her freedom."

It was determined in the affirmative: Yeas 23, nays 20.

On motion by Mr. Mills,

The yeas and nays being desired by one-fifth of the Senators present,

Those who voted in the affirmative are:

Messrs. Barbour of Va., Benton, Brown of La., D'Wolf, Eaton, Elliott, Gaillard, Holmes of Mis Johnson of Ky., Johnson of La., King of Ala., Lloyd, Macon, Noble, Pleasants, Smith, Southa Stokes, Van Dyke, Walker, Ware, Williams of Miss., Williams of Tenn.

Those who voted in the negative are:

Messrs. Barton, Boardman, Brown of Ohio, Chandler, Dickerson, Findlay, Holmes of Me., Ki of N. Y., Knight, Lanman, Lowrie, Mills, Morril, Otis, Palmer, Parrot, Ruggles, Seymour, Thom VAN BUREN.—[*Senate Journal, page* 169.]

OFFICE OF THE CLERK OF THE H. R. OF THE U. S., WASHINGTON, *September* 11, 1840.

I do hereby certify that the foregoing, purporting to be an extract from the Journal of the Sena of the United States, has been truly and correctly copied therefrom.

HORATIO N. CRABB, *Ass't Clerk Ho. Reps. U. S.*

It thus appears that Mr. VAN BUREN voted *against* striking out the restriction on slave in the Territory of Florida. The principle of this restriction, and of the restriction in t case of Arkansas, was the same as that involved in the Missouri question.

Certified copies of the votes of Gen. HARRISON and Mr. VAN BUREN, referred to the foregoing section:

On the 16th February, 1819, "the House took up and proceeded to consider the amen ments reported from the Committee of the Whole, to the bill to authorize the people the Territory of *Missouri* to form a Constitution and State Government, and for the adm sion of such State into the Union, on an equal footing with the original States; and t said amendments, being read, were concurred in by the House, with the exception of th to the end of the 4th section, which prohibits slavery or involuntary servitude in the pr posed State; which said amendment being amended to read as follows:

"And provided, also, *That the further introduction of slavery or involuntary servitude be pro bited, except for the punishment of crimes, whereof the party shall be duly convicted; and that all ch dren of slaves, born within the said State, after the admission thereof into the Union, shall be free, l may be held to service until the age of twenty-five years.*

"Mr. Beecher moved further to amend the said amendment, by striking out all thereof after t word *convicted;* which motion was rejected.

"A division of the question to agree to the said amendment was then called for, and the questi was put to agree to so much thereof as is contained within the same, to the word *convicted,* inclusi and passed in the affirmative: Yeas 87, Nays 76.

"The yeas and nays being required by one-fifth of the members present, those who voted in t affirmative are—

"Messrs. Adams, Allen, Anderson, *Pa.*, Barber, *O.*, Bateman, Beecher. Bennett, Boden, Campb Clagett, Comstock, Crafts, Cushman, Darlington, Drake, Ellicott, Folger, Fuller, Gage, Gilbert, Ha Hall, *Del.*, Hasbrouck, Hendricks, Herkimer, Herrick, Heister, Hitchcock, Hopkinson, Hostett Hubbard, Hunter, Huntington, Irving, *N. Y.*, Kinsey, Kirtland, Lawyer, Lincoln, Linn, Livermo W. Maclay, W. P. Maclay, Marchand, Mason, *R. I.*, Merrill, Mills, Robert Moore, Samuel Moo Morton, Moseley, Murray, Jer. Nelson, Ogle, Orr, Palmer, Patterson, Pawling, Pitkin, Rice, Ri Richards, Rogers, Ruggles, Sampson, Savage, Schuyler, Scudder, Sergeant, Sherwood, Silsb Southard, Spencer, Talmadge, Taylor, Terry, Tompkins, Townsend, Upham, Wallace, Wendov Westerlo, Whiteside, Wilkin, Williams, *Con.*, Williams, *N. Y.*, Wilson, *Mass.*, Wilson, *Pa.*—87.

"Those who voted in the negative are—

"Messrs. Abbott, Anderson, *Ken.*, Austin, Ball, Barbour, *Va.*, Bassett, Bayley, Bloomfield, Blou Bryan, Burwell, Butler, *Lou.*, Cobb, Colston, Cook, Cruger, Culbreth, Davidson, Desha, Edwa Ervin, *S. C.*, Fisher, Garnett, Hall, *N. C.*, HARRISON, Holmes, Johnson, *Va.*, Johnson, *K* Jones, Lewis, Little, Lowndes, McLane, *Del.*, McLean, *Ill.*, McCoy, Marr, Mason, *Mass.*, Middlet H. Nelson, T. M. Nelson, Nesbitt, New, Newton, Ogden, Owen, Parrott, Pegram, Peter, Pind Pleasants, Poindexter, Reed, Rhea, Ringgold, Robertson, Sawyer, Settle, Shaw, Simkins, Slocu S. Smith, Bal. Smith, Alexander Smyth, J. S. Smith, Speed, Stewart, *N. C.*, Storrs, Stuart, M Terrell, Trimble, Tucker, *Va.*, Tucker, *S. C.*, Tyler, Walker, *N. C.*, Walker, *Ken.*, Williams, *N. C.*—

"The question was then put upon agreeing to the residue of the said amendment, and also pas in the affirmative: Yeas 82, Nays 78.

"The yeas and nays being required by one-fifth of the members present, those who voted in affirmative are—

"Messrs. Adams, Allen, *Mass.*, Anderson, *Pa.*, Barber, *O.*, Bateman, Bennett, Boden, Clagett, Comstock, Crafts, Cushman, Darlington, Drake, Ellicott, Folger, Fuller, Gage, Gilbert, Hale, Hall, *Del.*, Hasbrouck, Hendricks, Herkimer, Herrick, Heister, Hitchcock, Hopkinson, Hostetter, Hubbard, Hunter, Huntington, Irving, *N. Y.*, Kinsey, Kirtland, Lawyer, Lincoln, Livermore, W. Maclay, W. P. Maclay, Marchand, Merrill, Mills, Robert Moore, Samuel Moore, Morton, Moseley, Murray, Jer. Nelson, Ogle, Orr, Palmer, Patterson, Pawling, Pitkin, Rice, Rich, Richards, Rogers, Ruggles, Sampson, Savage, Scudder, Sergeant, Sherwood, Silsbee, S. Smith, Southard, Spencer, Tallmadge, Taylor, Terry, Tompkins, Townsend, Upham, Wallace, Wendover, Whiteside, Wilkin, Williams, *Con.*, Williams, *N. Y.*, Wilson, *Mass.*, Wilson, *Pa.*—82.

"Those who voted in the negative are—

"Messrs. Abbott, Anderson, *Ken.*, Austin, Ball, Barbour, *Va.*, Bassett, Bayley, Beecher, Bloomfield, Blount, Bryan, Burwell, Butler, *Lou.*, Campbell, Cobb, Colston, Cook, Cruger, Culbreth, Davidson, Desha, Edwards, Ervin, *S. C.*, Fisher, Garnett, Hall, *N. C.*, HARRISON, Holmes, Johnson, *Va.*, Johnson, *Ken.*, Jones, Lewis, Linn, Little, Lowndes, McLean, *Ill.*, McCoy, Marr, Mason, *Mass.*, Mason, *R. I.*, Middleton, H. Nelson, S. M. Nelson, Nesbitt, New, Newton, Ogden, Owen, Parrott, Pegram, Peter, Pindall, Pleasants, Poindexter, Reed, Rhea, Ringgold, Robertson, Sawyer, Settle, Shaw, Simkins, Slocumb, Bal. Smith, Alexander Smyth, J. S. Smith, Speed, Stewart, *N. C.*, Storrs, Stuart, *Md.*, Terrell, Trimble, Tucker, *Va.*, Tucker, *S. C.*, Tyler, Walker, *N. C.*, Walker, *Ken.*, Williams, *N. C.*—78. [House Journal 1818–'19, pp. 271—274.]

On the 18th of February, 1819, the following proceedings, in regard to the Territory of *Arkansas*, were had in the House of Representatives:

"The House took up and proceeded to consider the amendments reported from the Committee of the Whole, to the bill establishing a separate Territorial Government in the southern part of the Territory of Missouri; and the said amendments, having been read, were concurred in by the House.

"Mr. Taylor then moved further to amend the said bill, by inserting the following as the second section thereof:

"*And be it further enacted*, That neither slavery nor involuntary servitude shall be introduced into the said Territory, otherwise than for the punishment of crimes, whereof the party shall have been duly convicted. And all children born of slaves, within the said Territory, shall be free, but may be held to service until the age of twenty-five years.

"A division of the question, to agree to the said amendment, was called for; and the question was put on so much thereof as is contained within the same, down to the word *convicted*, inclusive, and determined in the negative: Yeas 70, Nays 71.

"The yeas and nays being required by one-fifth of the members present, those who voted in the affirmative are—

"Messrs. Adams, Allen, *Mass.*, Anderson, *Pa.*, Barber, *O.*, Bateman, Bennett, Boden, Boss, Comstock, Crafts, Cushman, Darlington, Drake, Folger, Fuller, Hall, *Del.*, Hasbrouck, Hendricks, Herrick, Hiester, Hitchcock, Hostetter, Hubbard, Hunter, Huntington, Irving, *N. Y.*, Lawyer, Lincoln, Linn, Livermore, W. Maclay, W. P. Maclay, Marchand, Mason, *R. I.*, Merrill, Robert Moore, Samuel Moore, Morton, Moseley, Murray, Jer. Nelson, Ogle, Orr, Palmer, Patterson, Pawling, Rice, Rich, Richards, Rogers, Ruggles, Sampson, Savage, Scudder, Seybert, Sherwood, Southard, Spencer, Tallmadge, Tarr, Taylor, Terry, Tompkins, Townsend, Wallace, Wendover, Whiteside, Williams, *Con.*, Williams, *N. Y.*, Wilson, *Pa.*—70.

"Those who voted in the negative are—

"Messrs. Anderson, *Ken.*, Austin, Ball, Barbour, *Va.*, Bassett, Bayley, Beecher, Bloomfield, Blount, Bryan, Burwell, Butler, *Lou.*, Cobb, Cook, Crawford, Culbreth, Desha, Earl, Edwards, Garnett, Hall, *N. C.*, HARRISON, Hogg, Holmes, Johnson, *Va.*, Johnson, *Ken.*, Jones, Kinsey, Lewis, Little, Lowndes, McLane, *Del.*, McLean, *Ill.*, McCoy, Marr, Mason, *Mass.*, H. Nelson, T. M. Nelson, New, Newton, Ogden, Owen, Parrott, Pegram, Peter, Pindall, Pleasants, Porter, Quarles, Reed, *Ga.*, Rhea, Robertson, Sawyer, Settle, Shaw, Simkins, Slocumb, S. Smith, Alexander Smyth, J. S. Smith, Speed, Stewart, *N. C.*, Storrs, Stuart, *Md.*, Terrell, Trimble, Tucker, *Va.*, Tucker, *S. C.*, Taylor, Walker, *N. C.*, Williams, *N. C.*—71.

"The question was then put to agree to the residue of the said amendment, and passed in the affirmative: Yeas 75, Nays 73.

"The yeas and nays being required by one-fifth of the members present, those who voted in the affirmative are—

"Messrs. Adams, Anderson, *Pa.*, Barber, *Ohio*, Bateman, Bennett, Boden, Boss, Comstock, Crafts, Cushman, Darlington, Drake, Ellicott, Folger, Fuller, Gilbert, Hall, *Del.*, Hasbrouck, Hendricks, Herrick, Hiester, Hitchcock, Hostetter, Hubbard, Hunter, Huntington, Irving, *N. Y.*, Kirtland, Lawyer, Lincoln, Linn, Livermore, W. Maclay, W. P. Maclay, Marchand, Merrill, Mills, Robert Moore, Samuel Moore, Morton, Mosely, Murray, Jeremiah Nelson, Ogle, Orr, Palmer, Patterson, Pawling, Rice, Rich, Richards, Rogers, Ruggles, Sampson, Savage, Schuyler, Scudder, Seybert, Sherwood, Southard, Spencer, Tallmadge, Tarr, Taylor, Terry, Tompkins, Townsend, Wallace, Wendover, Westerlo, Whiteside, Williams, *Con.*, Williams, *N. C.*, Williams, *N. Y.*, Wilson, *Pa.*—75.

"Those who voted in the negative are—

"Messrs. Abbott, Anderson, *Ky.*, Austin, Ball, Barbour, *Va.*, Bassett, Bayley, Beecher, Bloomfield, Blount, Bryan, Burwell, Butler, *La.*, Cobb, Cook, Crawford, Cruger, Culbreth, Desha, Earl, Edwards, Garnett, Hall, *N. C.*, HARRISON, Hogg, Holmes, Johnson, *Va.*, Johnson, *Ky.*, Jones, Kinsey, Lewis,

Little, Lowndes, Mallory, *Md.*, McLean, *Ill.*, McCoy, Marr, Mason, *Mass.*, Middleton, H Nelson T. M. Nelson, Nesbitt, New, Ogden, Owen, Parrott, Pegram, Peter, Pindall, Pleasants, Quarles Reed, *Md.*, Reed, *Ga.*, Rhea, Robertson, Sawyer, Settle, Shaw, Simkins, Slocumb, S. Smith, Alex Smyth, J. S. Smith, Speed, Stewart, *N. C.*, Storrs, Stuart, *Md.*, Terrell, Trimble, Tucker, *Va.* Tucker, *S. C.*, Tyler, Walker, *N. C.*—73."

OFFICE, HO. REPS. OF THE U. S., WASHINGTON, *September* 9, 1840.

This is to certify that the foregoing writing, on seven pages of paper, is a true extract from the Journal of the House of Representatives of the United States on the 16th and 18th days of February 1819. This certificate is given at the request of the Hon. John C. Clarke, now a member of the House of Representatives from the State of New-York.

H. A. GARLAND, *Clerk Ho. Reps. U. S.*

VI. ABOLITINISM.

Enough appears in the foregoing pages to show that GENERAL HARRISON is not an Abolionist. The following remarks were made by him *before* he was a candidate for the Presidency:

Extracts of General Harrison's speech at Cheviot, Ohio, July 4, 1833.

There is, however, a subject now beginning to agitate them, [the Southern States,] in relation to which, if their alarm has any foundation, the relative situation in which they may stand to some of the States will be the very reverse to what it now is. I allude to a supposed disposition in some individuals in the non-slaveholding States to interfere with the slave population of the other States, for the purpose of forcing their emancipation. *I do not call your attention to this subject, fellow-citizens, from the apprehension that there is a man among you who will lend his aid to a project so pregnant with mischief, and still less that there is a State in the Union which could be brought to give it any countenance.* But such are the feelings of our Southern brethren upon this subject—such their views, and their just views, of the evils which an interference of this kind would bring upon them, that long before it would reach the point of receiving the sanction of a State, the evil of the attempt would be consummated, as far as we are concerned, by a dissolution of the Union. *If there is any principle of the Constitution of the United States less disputable than any other, it is, that the slave population is under the exclusive control of the States which possess them.* If there is any measure likely to rivet the chains and blast the prospects of the negroes for emancipation, it is the interference of unauthorized persons. Can any one who is acquainted with the operations of the human mind doubt this? We have seen how restive our Southern brethren have been, from a supposed violation of their political rights. *What must be the consequence of an acknowledged violation of these rights, (for every man of sense must admit it to be so,) conjoined with an insulting interference with their domestic concerns?*

Shall I be accused of want of feeling for the slave, by these remarks? A further examination will elucidate the matter. *I take it for granted that no one will say that either the Government of the United States or those of the non-slaveholding States can interfere in any way with the right of property in the slaves.* Upon whom, then, are the efforts of the misguided and pretended friends of the slaves to operate? It must be either on the Governments of the slaveholding States, the individuals who hold them, or upon the slaves themselves. What are to be the arguments, what the means, by which they are to influence the two first of these? Is there a man vain enough to go to the land of Madison, of Macon, and of Crawford, and tell them that they either do not understand the principles of the moral and political rights of man; or that, understanding, they disregard them? Can they address an argument to the interest or fears of the enlightened population of the slave States, that has not occurred to themselves a thousand and a thousand times? To whom, then, are they to address themselves but to the slaves? And what can be said to them, that will not lead to an indiscriminate slaughter of every age and sex, and ultimately to their own destruction? *Should there be an incarnate devil who has imagined with approbation such a catastrophe to his fellow-citizens as I have described, let him look to those for whose benefit he would produce it.* Particular sections of the country may be laid waste, all the crimes that infuriated man, under the influence of all the black passions of his nature, can commit, may be perpetrated for a season; the tides of the ocean, however, will no more certainly change, than that the flood of horrors will be arrested, and turned upon those who may get it in motion.

I will not stop to inquire into the motives of those who are engaged in this fatal and unconstitutional project. There may be some who have embarked in it without properly considering its consequences, and who are actuated by benevolent and virtuous principles. But, if such there are, I am very certain that, should they continue their present course, their fellow-citizens will, ere long, 'curse the virtues which have undone their country.'

Should I be asked if there is no way by which the General Government can aid the cause of emancipation, I answer, that it has long been an object near my heart to see the whole of its surplus

revenue appropriated to that object. With the sanction of the States holding the slaves, there appears to me to be no constitutional objection to its being thus applied; embracing not only the colonization of those that may be otherwise freed, but the purchase of freedom of others. By a zealous prosecution of a plan formed upon that basis, we might look forward to a day, not very distant, when a North American sun would not look down upon a slave. To those who have rejected the plan of colonization, I would ask, if they have well weighed the consequences of emancipation without it? How long would the emancipated negroes remain satisfied with that? Would any one of the Southern States then (the negroes armed and organized) be able to resist their claims to a participation in all their political rights? Would it even stop there? Would they not claim admittance to all the social rights and privileges of a community in which, in some instances, they would compose the majority? Let those who take pleasure in the contemplation of such scenes as must inevitably follow, finish out the picture.

If I am correct in the principles here advanced, I support my assertion, that the discussion on the subject of emancipation in the non-slaveholding States, is equally injurious to the slaves and their masters, and that it has no sanction in the principles of the Constitution. I must not be understood to say, that there is any thing in that instrument which prohibits such discussion. I know there is not. But the man who believes that the claims which his fellow-citizens have upon him are satisfied by adhering to the letter of the political contract that connect them, must have a very imperfect knowledge of the principles upon which our glorious Union was formed, and by which alone it can be maintained. I mean those feelings of regard and affection which were manifested in the first dawn of our Revolution, which induced every American to think that an injury inflicted upon his fellow-citizen, however distant his location, was an injury to himself; which made us, in effect, one people, before we had any paper contract; which induced the venerable Shelby, in the second war for independence, to leave the comforts which age required, to encounter the dangers and privations incident to a wilderness war; which drew from the same quarter the innumerable battalions of volunteers which preceded and followed him; and from the banks of the distant Appommattox, that band of youthful heroes, which has immortalized the appellation by which it was distinguished. Those worthy sons of immortal sires did not stop to inquire into the alleged injustice and immotality of the Indian war. It was sufficient for them to learn their fellow-citizens were in danger, that the tomahawk and scalping-knife were suspended over the heads of the women and children of Ohio, to induce them to abandon the ease, and, in many instances, the luxury and splendor by which from infancy they had been surrounded, to encounter the fatigues and dangers of war, amidst the horrors of a Canadian winter.

In 1835, *after* he was nominated for the Presidency, GENERAL HARRISON delivered the speech at Vincennes, Indiania, which we have before cited, and which the Abolitionists call "*infamous.*" The following is extracted from it:

Extracts from General Harrison's speech at Vincennes, Indiana, July 4, 1835.

I have now, fellow-citizens, a few words more to say on another subject, and which is, in my opinion, of more importance than any other that is now in the course of discussion in any part of the Union. I allude to the societies which have been formed, and the movements of certain individuals, in some of the States, in relation to a portion of the population in others. The conduct of these persons is the more dangerous, because their object is masked under the garb of disinterestedness and benevolence; and their course vindicated by arguments and propositions which, in the abstract, no one can deny. But however fascinating may be the dress with which their schemes are presented to their fellow-citizens, with whatever purity of intention they may have been formed and sustained, they will be found to carry in their train mischief to the whole Union, and horrors to a large portion of it, which it is probable some of the projectors and many of their supporters have never thought of; the latter, the first in the series of evils which are to spring from this source, are such as you have read of to have been perpetrated on the fair plains of Italy and Gaul by the Scythian hordes of Atilla and Alaric; and such as most of you apprehended upon that memorable night, when the tomahawks and war-clubs of the followers of Tecumseh were rattling in your suburbs. I regard not the disavowals of any such intention on the part of the authors of these schemes, since, upon the examination of the publications which have been made, they will be found to contain every fact and every argument which would have been used if such had been their objects. I am certain that there is not in this assembly one of these deluded men, and that there are few within the bounds of the State. If there are any, I would earnestly entreat them to forbear, to pause in their career, and deliberately consider the consequences of their conduct to the whole Union, to the States more immediately interested, and to those for whose benefit they profess to act. That the latter will be the victims of the weak, injudicious, presumptuous, and unconstitutional efforts to serve them, a thorough examination of the subject must convince them. The struggle (and struggle there must be) may commence with horrors such as I have described, but it will end with more firmly riveting the chains, or in the utter extirpation of those whose cause they advocate. *Am I wrong, fellow-citizens, in applying the terms weak, presumptuous, and unconstitutional, to the measures of the emancipators?* A slight examination will, I think, show that I am not. In a vindication of the objects of a convention which was lately held in one of the towns of Ohio, which I saw in a newspaper, it was said that nothing more was intended than to produce a state of public feeling which would lead to an amendment of the Constitution, authorizing the abolition of slavery in the United States. Now, can an

amendment of the Constitution be effected without the consent of the Southern States? What, then, is the proposition to be submitted to them? It is this: The present provisions of the Constitution secure to you the right (a right which you held before it was made, and which you have never given up) to manage your domestic concerns in your own way; but as we are convinced that you do not manage them properly, we want you to put in the hands of the General Government, in the councils of which we have the majority, the control over these matters, the effect of which will be virtually to transfer the power from yours into our hands. Again, in some of the States, and in sections of others, the black population far exceeds that of the white. Some the emancipators propose an immediate abolition. What is the proposition, then, as it regards those States and parts of States, but the alternatives of amalgamation with the blacks, or an exchange of situations with them? Is there any man of common sense who does not believe that the emancipated blacks, being a majority, will not insist upon a full participation of political rights with the whites, and, when possessed of these, that they will not contend for a full share of social rights also? What but the extremity of weakness and folly could induce any one to think that such propositions as these could be listened to by a people so intelligent as those of the Southern States? Further, the emancipators generally declare that it is their intention to effect their object (although their acts contradict the assertion) by no other means than by convincing the slaveholders that the immediate emancipation of the slaves is called for both by moral obligation and sound policy. An unfledged youth at the moment of his leaving (indeed, in many instances before he has left it) his Theodogical Seminary, undertakes to give lectures upon morals to the countrymen of Wythe, Tucker, Pendleton, and Lowndes, and lessons of political wisdom to States whose affairs have so recently been directed by Jefferson and Madison, Macon and Crawford. Is it possible that instances of greater vanity and presumption could be exhibited?

But the course pursued by the emancipators is unconstitutional. I do not say that there are any words in the Constitution which forbid such discussions as they say they are engaged in. I know that there are not. And there is even an article which secures to the citizens the right to express and publish their opinions without restriction. But in the construction of the constitution it is always necessary to refer to the circumstances under which it was framed, and to ascertain its meaning by a comparison of its provisions with each other, and with the previous situation of the several States who were parties to it. In a portion of these slavery was recognised, and they took care to have the right secured to them to follow and reclaim such of them as were fugitives to other States. The laws of Congress passed under this power have provided punishment to any who shall oppose or interrupt the exercise of this right. Now, can any one believe that the instrument which contains a provision of this kind, which authorizes a master to pursue his slave into another State, take him back, and provides a punishment for any citizen or citizens of that State who should oppose him, should at the same time authorize the latter to assemble together, to pass resolutions and adopt addresses, not only to encourage the slaves to leave their masters, but to cut their throats before they do so? I insist that, if the citizens of the non-slaveholding States can avail themselves of the article of the constitution which prohibits the restriction of speech or of the press, to publish any thing injurious to the rights of the slaveholding States, they can go to the extreme that I have mentioned, and effect any thing further which writing or speaking could effect. But, fellow-citizens, these are not the principles of the constitution. Such a construction would defeat one of the great objects of its formation, which was that of securing the peace and harmony of the States which were parties to it. The liberty of speech and of the press were given as the most effectual means to preserve to each and every citizen their own rights, and to the States the rights which appertained to them at the time of its adoption.

It could never have been expected that it would be used by the citizens of one portion of the States for the purpose of depriving those of another portion of the rights which they had reserved at the adoption of the constitution, and in the exercise of which none but themselves have any concern or interest. If slavery is an evil, (and no one more readily acknowledges it than I do,) the evil is with them. If there is guilt in it, the guilt is theirs, not ours, *since neither the States where it does not exist, nor the Government of the United States, can, without usurpation of power and the violation of a solemn compact, do any thing to remove it without the consent of those who are immediately interested.* With that consent, there is not a man in the whole world who would more willingly contribute his aid to accomplish it than I would. If my vote could effect it, every surplus dollar in the Treasury should be appropriated to that object. But they will neither ask for aid nor consent to be aided, so long as the illegal, persecuting, and dangerous movements are in progress of which I complain; the interest of all concerned requires that these should be immediately stopped. This can only be done by the force of public opinion, and that cannot too soon be brought into operation. Every movement which is made by the abolitionists in the non-slaveholding States is viewed by our Southern brethren as an attack upon their rights, and which, if persisted in, must in the end eradicate those feelings of attachment and affection between the citizens of all the States which were produced by a community of interests and dangers in the war of the Revolution, which was the foundation of our happy Union, and by a continuance of which it alone can be preserved. I entreat you, then, fellow-citizens, to frown upon the measures which are to produce results so much to be deprecated. The opinions which I have now given, I have omitted no opportunity for the last two years to lay before the people of my own State. I have taken the liberty to express them here, knowing that, even if they should unfortunately not accord with yours, they would be kindly received.

39 W

WERT BOOKBINDING
JAN 1989
Grantville, PA